

APPLICANT(S): REUVEN, Yossi  
SERIAL NO.: 10/664,850  
FILED: September 22, 2003  
Page 7

### REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

### Status of Claims

Claims 1, 6-8, 11, 12, 18, 23 and 24 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 8, 12, 18, have been amended. Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

Claims 3, 14, 20 have been cancelled in this submission with prejudice to being re-included or resubmitted in a future submission or application.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS

#### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as being unpatentable over Brown (US 6,333,678) in view of Kawano (US 6,181,923). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

Brown discloses deriving an output frequency from a first frequency. However, Brown does not disclose the invention recited in claim 1.

Initially, Brown does not disclose a dual output synthesizer, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Brown does not disclose outputting a first output signal on a first output and outputting a second output signal on a second output. Rather, Brown discloses only a single

APPLICANT(S): REUVEN, Yossi  
SERIAL NO.: 10/664,850  
FILED: September 22, 2003  
Page 8

input signal used to produce a single output signal. Likewise, with respect to claim 8, Brown does not disclose a method of synthesizing signals by a dual output synthesizer.

Second, even if a first output were taken between the two phased locked loops of Brown (e.g., at synthesizer A/B 208 of Fig. 3), Brown would still not disclose “an integer divider synthesizer coupled to the first output to receive at least a portion of the first output signal to be used as the fundamental frequency of the integer divider synthesizer. . .” For example, in Brown Fig. 3, the integer divider 330 does not have as its fundamental frequency the output of synthesizer A/B 208.

Third, Brown does not teach or disclose that the second frequency is substantially similar to the first frequency. The Examiner points to Brown col. 7, lines 41-58, which states that the divider in the first phase locked loop may have division value  $P1$ , and the second phase locked loop may have division value  $P2$ , where the total division value  $N=P1 \times P2$ . However, Brown teaches that “a value of  $P1=N$  would obviate a need for a divider in the feedback path.” (emphasis added). Therefore, Brown teaches that when the second feedback loop requires division by 1, the integer divider is eliminated. Therefore, Brown actually teaches away from “an integer divider synthesizer coupled to the first output . . . wherein the second frequency is substantially similar to the first frequency” as recited in claim 1.

Kawano also teaches away from the invention recited in claim 1. Kawano discloses first and second loops, but these are used to derive two distinctly different frequencies. Specifically, Kawano discloses that “frequency of the received local signal and the frequency of the transmitted local signal are always established by fixed spacing, by this multiplier 305.” (Kawano col. 9 lines 38-40, emphasis added). Therefore, Kawano does not disclose and in fact teaches away from “wherein the second frequency is substantially similar to the first frequency,” as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 is therefore neither anticipated nor obvious over the art of record, and is therefore allowable. Claims 6 and 7, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, are

APPLICANT(S): REUVEN, Yossi  
SERIAL NO.: 10/664,850  
FILED: September 22, 2003  
Page 9

also allowable. Claims 8, 11, 12, 18, 23 and 24 are allowable over the art of record for reasons similar to claim 1, above.


Particularly regarding claim 12, neither Brown nor Kawano discloses "a transceiver operably coupled to the dual output synthesizer having first and second mixers operably coupled to the first and second outputs respectively, wherein the frequency of the second output signal is substantially similar to the frequency of the first output signal" as recited, nor would this have been obvious in light of Brown and Kawano.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,



Guy Yonay  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Registration 52,388  
No.

Dated: September 24, 2007

**Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP**  
1500 Broadway, 12th Floor  
New York, New York 10036  
Tel: (646) 878-0800  
Fax: (646) 878-0801